

20030830.qrp v03_n028.qrl.20030830

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 19:03:09 EDT
From: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: QRP-L digest 3028

QRP-L Digest 3028

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) [157042] BLT Kit
by Rick McKee <kc8aon@juno.com>
- 2) [157043] BPL: The NTIA weighs in (long)
by kenneth hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
- 3) [157044] Re: Other lists?
by George Fremin III <geoiii@kkn.net>
- 4) [157045] YAHOO emails
by Ed Tanton <n4xy@earthlink.net>
- 5) [157046] Re: Other lists?
by "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>
- 6) [157047] Re: YAHOO emails
by Bud Rogers <budr@netride.net>
- 7) [157048] Re: YAHOO emails
by "Rod NØRC" <rod@nØrc.us>
- 8) [157049] Web link: dipole antenna introduction
by Tim Groat <tcgroat@earthlink.net>
- 9) [157050] FS : DSW-20 **SOLD**
by wo7t@juno.com
- 10) [157051] FS: Keyer & Freq. Counter
by wo7t@juno.com
- 11) [157052] SMD question
by Peter Burbank <peterlee@qx.net>
- 12) [157053] OT: FS 40 Meter Rock Mite/HB Version BLT Tuner
by "Jim Sheldon" <w0eb@cox.net>
- 13) [157054] Re: YAHOO emails
by "Rod NØRC" <rod@nØrc.us>
- 14) [157055] Re: YAHOO emails
by "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>
- 15) [157056] WTB : TT Model 979 Power supply
by "George Osier" <gosier@twcnny.rr.com>
- 16) [157057] Re: SuSe 8.2 disks
by "Joe Spencer" <kk5na@kk5na.com>
- 17) [157058] "SuperAntennas" PW-1/MP-1 tune-up
by "Rod NØRC" <rod@nØrc.us>
- 18) [157059] OT: FS 40 Meter Rock Mite/HB Version BLT Tuner - Both are SOLD
by "Jim Sheldon" <w0eb@cox.net>
- 19) [157060] Re: SMD question

- by "Leon Heller" <leon_heller@hotmail.com>
- 20) [157061] FT243 crystals
by "Hudson, Steve (RBI-US RCD)" <sdhudson@reedbusiness.com>
- 21) [157062] Chart for SMD identifying?
by Steve Ratzlaff <steveratz@eoni.com>
- 22) [157063] Re: SMD question
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 23) [157064] Multiband QRP Tx with < 20 parts
by "Leon Heller" <leon_heller@hotmail.com>
- 24) [157065] FS: 2N2/40 Transceiver
by "Alan Fryer" <N3BJ@hotmail.com>
- 25) [157066] Comments
by Wayne Rogers <w5kdj@juno.com>
- 26) [157067] Re: Benchner "Look Alikes"
by "Tim" <kd5ckp@centurytel.net>
- 27) [157068] NorCal BLT
by Shawn Upton <kb1ckt@yahoo.com>
- 28) [157069] Coming Soon! ! !
by "NR5A" <nr5a@rap.midco.net>
- 29) [157070] Re: Coming Soon! ! !
by "Jerry Ford" <benlightnd13@mchsi.com>
- 30) [157071] AGC
by Jack e wigal <kr8z1@juno.com>
- 31) [157072] White Mountain 75
by Jack e wigal <kr8z1@juno.com>
- 32) [157073] Sold keyer and sw-30
by "Martin Hartwell" <chartwell@worldnet.att.net>
- 33) [157074] URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
- 34) [157075] FCC Petitions
by "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
- 35) [157076] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "John Sielke" <jsielke@pobox.com>
- 36) [157077] SWL SW-XX+ Series
by Chuck Adams <k7qo@commspeed.net>
- 37) [157078] FCC Petition Nuimbers
by "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
- 38) [157079] FS: Trimmer Caps
by "Howard Kraus" <K2UD@adelphia.net>
- 39) [157080] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "Russ Hines" <wb8zcc@fuse.net>
- 40) [157081] OT, slightly
by "Tom Bowman" <wa3rey@comcast.net>
- 41) [157082] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "n3drk" <n3drk@triad.rr.com>
- 42) [157083] Re: OT, slightly
by "w8diz" <w8diz@cinci.rr.com>
- 43) [157084] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment

by Paul <mooney@cytanet.com.cy>

44) [157085] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "Scott Rosenfeld [N7JI]" <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>

45) [157086] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
by "Lawrence Makoski" <Makos327@worldnet.att.net>

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 18:44:30 -0400
From: Rick McKee <kc8aon@juno.com>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU, fpqrp-1@mpna.com
Subject: [157042] BLT Kit
Message-ID: <20030829.184549.9086.1.kc8aon@juno.com>

Gang,

Got the BLT kit finished last night in about 2 hours, and that included the addition of the unbalanced mod. Works great, tuned my 40 meter extended double zepp in a snap ! That little LED is VERY visible ! Nice tuner, very rugged enclosure ! Now, gotta get started on the SW-20+ !

72/73 de: Rick McKee, KC8AON <> Willow Wood, Ohio <> Grid: EM88rl
SW 40+, Norcal Cascade, Yaesu FT-7,
Homebrew 6V6 tube TX & Hallicrafters SW500 RX
QRP-L #2112, FPqrp #33, AR QRP AmQRP
I'll give up CW when I'm dead ! MAYBE !

The best thing to hit the internet in years - Juno SpeedBand!
Surf the web up to FIVE TIMES FASTER!
Only \$14.95/ month - visit www.juno.com to sign up today!

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 19:35:36 -0400
From: kenneth hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157043] BPL: The NTIA weighs in (long)
Message-ID: <3F4FE348.1080401@wfu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Gang--

Today's mail brought a real suprise: a very nice letter from Thomas Sullivan, Chief of the Spectrum Engineering branch for the NTIA. His letter notes the NTIA is "extensively studying the issues raised in your

letter." Included was the full text of the NTIA's response to the comments.

From that response, the following points were raised:

--BPL "holds great promise as a new source of innovation and competition in the broadband marketplace."

--In BOLD and caps: "Notwithstanding BPL's potential benefits, the commission must ensure that other communications services, especially federal government operations, are adequately protected from unacceptable interference."

--"the Commission must be certain to provide all communications stakeholders with adequate protections against BPL emissions that may cause unacceptable radio frequency interference." (Notice this is not a request!)

--The filing notes there are over 18,000 frequencies in the 1.7-80MHz spectrum "in which BPL systems may unintentionally radiate." This is followed by a footnote that notes the non-linear elements in the electrical distribution system may well lead to emissions at frequencies higher than 80 MHz.

--"Consequently the NTIA has broad concerns with radiated emission limits and other measures that may be needed to protect these systems."

--in BOLD and caps: "NTIA is launching extensive modeling, analysis, and measurement efforts for BPL and we encourage the Commission to consider our findings as it moves forward in the BPL proceeding."

--what follows is a technical discussion of modeling parameters, the process of making actual field measures of the range of spectra affected (sort of a dressed-up Ed Hare process), and the reviewing of all relevant European data. "The NTIA expects to conclude its modeling, analysis, and measurement efforts by the end of 2003."

The overall impression one gets is the NTIA is mounting an all-out technical review to demonstrate this is an unworkable technology due to the radiation of rf across the electromagnetic spectrum. If Ed's ARRL data was at all close, the NTIA will discover the same hf interference with their high-tech measuring process, and unless someone can demonstrate a technology to suppress these unregulated emissions, the NTIA will oppose the implementation of BPL.

73,

Ken KG4FGC

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 19:00:30 -0500
From: George Fremin III <geoiiii@kkn.net>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157044] Re: Other lists?
Message-ID: <200308300000030.GA21833@kkn.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

>
> > Are there any other good mailing lists like this one dealing with other
> subjects related to ham radio?

Yes there are:

Here are some of the very good lists that cover various subjects.

AMPS Mail List
CQ-Contest Mail List
RFI Mail List
TenTec Mail List
TopBand 160 Meter Mail List
TowerTalk Mail List
....and several more
You can find these here:

<http://lists.contesting.com/mailman/listinfo>
Most if not all of the lists at [contesting.com](http://lists.contesting.com) have a very high
signal to noise ratio. They also have people on them that
really do know what they are talking about on these subjects.

> > Maybe some good EE lists, RDF stuff, specific VHF/UHF/Microwave stuff, and

The above site has a VHF contesting list.

Several other vhf/uhf/microwave lists are:

The WSVHF list at qth.net

The microwave list at <http://www.wa1mba.org/>

The EME list:

EME listserve@vm.stlawu.edu Inside the body type: subscribe moon-net

ARDF -- Amateur Radio Direction Finding:

<http://loja.kkn.net/mailman/listinfo/ardf>

Also there are lists of lots of refelctors here:

<http://www.ac6v.com/mail.htm>

--

George Fremin III - K5TR

geoiiii@kkn.net

<http://www.kkn.net/~k5tr>

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:14:29 -0400
From: Ed Tanton <n4xy@earthlink.net>
To: qrp-L Reflector <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>, noga <nogaqrp@mailman.qth.net>
Subject: [157045] YAHOO emails
Message-ID: <5.2.1.1.2.20030829200712.023972b0@pop.earthlink.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I have once again been forced to place YAHOO.COM in my TOTAL REJECT category within my SPAM program. This comes as a result of a myriad of clever little variations for return addresses all from YAHOO blatantly soliciting porn/etc. DOZENS daily is a bit much.

Anyone wanting to communicate with me using YAHOO will have to either: 1) give up; 2) use another address; or 3) get someone to pass your message along to me. I am providing this notice because of the number of QSL.NET reflectors I manage.

I urge everyone to discuss this with YAHOO, as I have. They're free to do business as they see fit, but I don't have to read it.

72/73 Ed Tanton N4XY <n4xy@earthlink.net>

Ed Tanton N4XY
189 Pioneer Trail
Marietta, GA 30068-3466

website: <http://www.n4xy.com>

All emails <IN> & <OUT> checked by
Norton AntiVirus with AutoProtect

LM: ARRL QCWA AMSAT & INDEXA;
SEDXC NCDXA GACW QRP-ARCI
OK-QRP QRP-L #758 K2 (FT) #00057

"He that gives up a little liberty to gain
temporary security will lose both and
deserve neither".
--Benjamin Franklin

"Suppose you were an idiot ...
and suppose you were a member of
Congress... but I repeat myself."
--Mark Twain

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:19:05 -0400
From: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Cc: <kd7bcy@teleport.com>
Subject: [157046] Re: Other lists?
Message-ID: <001d01c36e8c\$52e08af0\$080044c0@BrianBoru>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm surprised nobody mentioned <http://www.qth.net>

They have literally hundreds of ham related lists, some good, some not so good.

72/73 de WB8RCR <http://www.qsl.net/wb8rcr>
didileydadidah QRP-L #1446 Code Warriors #35

----- Original Message -----
From: "John Rollins Jr" <kd7bcy@teleport.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2003 12:07 AM

Subject: Other lists?

> Are there any other good mailing lists like this one dealing with other subjects related to ham radio? I occasionally have ideas I'd like to bounce around on the internet that are OT for this group, and it's a pain to find the local experts on the repeaters and of course there aren't as many as can be found on a list like this :-)

> Maybe some good EE lists, RDF stuff, specific VHF/UHF/Microwave stuff, and so on. I hate to think of trying to get something off of eHam or the few other BBS-like sites(hmm... any good vBulletin or other decent BBS sites around? We need something for the ham community that is more organized and better moderated than eHam and such, along the lines of BladeForums.com or AR15.com)

>

>

> -JR

>

>

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:10:00 -0500
From: Bud Rogers <budr@netride.net>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157047] Re: YAHOO emails
Message-ID: <200308292010.00291.budr@netride.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

On Friday 29 August 2003 19:14, Ed Tanton wrote:

> I have once again been forced to place YAHOO.COM in my TOTAL REJECT
> category within my SPAM program. This comes as a result of a myriad
> of clever little variations for return addresses all from YAHOO
> blatantly soliciting porn/etc. DOZENS daily is a bit much.

Ed, have you looked into spam filtering? There is a new technique based on bayesian statistical methods that seems to work pretty well. The Paul Graham article got the ball rolling and others have picked up on his ideas. I used bogofilter on my linux box with excellent results.

Below are a couple of links you might find interesting. A google search on "bayesian spam filter" will turn up a bunch more.

<http://www.paulgraham.com/spam.html>
<http://home.dataparty.no/kristian/reviews/bayesian/>
<http://spambayes.sourceforge.net/>

73,

--

Bud Rogers <budr@netride.net> KD5SZ EM05vb

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 19:12:20 -0600
From: "Rod N0RC" <rod@n0rc.us>
To: <n4xy@earthlink.net>,
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157048] Re: YAHOO emails
Message-ID: <008401c36e93\$c356f650\$6501a8c0@greyrock>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ed,

Are you sure the emails were "SOURCED" from Yahoo? Email headers are very easy to forge, and a favorite trick of spammers. Here's is a link that may help to ID and possibly track down the real culprits.

<http://www.junkbusters.com/spam.html#track>

Not sure what Earthlink can do for you, but my ISP, FRII, uses mailarmory, I also use USA.NET's spam tools and I even have a Yahoo account (premium service) with spam filtering tools. All these service handle the "net lowlife" nicely with out having to resort to domain blocking. With few exceptions, domain blocking seems a heavy handed "baby out with the bathwater" approach.

73, Rod N0RC

----- Original Message -----

From: "Ed Tanton" <n4xy@earthlink.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 6:14 PM
Subject: YAHOO emails

> I have once again been forced to place YAHOO.COM in my TOTAL REJECT
> category within my SPAM program. This comes as a result of a myriad of
> clever little variations for return addresses all from YAHOO blatantly

Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:33:30 -0600
From: Tim Groat <tcgroat@earthlink.net>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157049] Web link: dipole antenna introduction
Message-ID: <5.1.1.6.2.20030829202416.00a52740@mail.earthlink.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

In a moment of serendipity, I found this web page while searching for something completely different. It's a nice introduction to the dipole antenna and how it works. The finicky will pick at the concept of the balun causing the resonant length to be shorter than a physical half-wavelength, but it's still a good article, imo. (Hint: the resonant length is shortened even with no balun).

<http://www.intuitor.com/resonance/radioTVres.html>

72,
--Tim (KR0U)

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 04:20:35 GMT
From: wo7t@juno.com
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.edu
Subject: [157050] FS : DSW-20 **SOLD**
Message-ID: <20030829.212111.4590.139331@webmail01.lax.unttd.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

Rig sold.....73, Mark

The best thing to hit the internet in years - Juno SpeedBand!
Surf the web up to FIVE TIMES FASTER!
Only \$14.95/ month - visit www.juno.com to sign up today!

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 04:24:48 GMT
From: wo7t@juno.com
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.edu
Subject: [157051] FS: Keyer & Freq. Counter
Message-ID: <20030829.212516.4590.139362@webmail01.lax.unttd.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

I have for sale at this time, the following:

OHR-DD1 Programmable Frequency Counter. Excellent operational
and physical condition. \$70 + actual shipping

LogicKey K1 Rev. 2 Memory Keyer \$75 + ship Excellent op and
physical shape as well.

Manuals included with all the above.

Tnx,
Mark
wo7t@juno.com

The best thing to hit the internet in years - Juno SpeedBand!
Surf the web up to FIVE TIMES FASTER!
Only \$14.95/ month - visit www.juno.com to sign up today!

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 03:20:11 -0400
From: Peter Burbank <peterlee@qx.net>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157052] SMD question
Message-ID: <5.2.0.9.0.20030830020411.00a07110@mail.qx.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

After fumbling around with the DDS SMT parts I started wondering about how
automated
machines cope with them. I poked around with google but did not find much.
Any good links?
It must be a fairly exotic process, unwrapping, positioning, holding and
soldering. Any info

or descriptions from anyone who has seen one of these machines run would be of interest.

Tnx es 73

Pete NV4V

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 06:55:58 -0500
From: "Jim Sheldon" <w0eb@cox.net>
To: "Four States QRP Group" <4sqrp@mailman.qth.net>,
"Flying Pigs Mailing List" <fpqrp-l@mpna.com>,
Subject: [157053] OT: FS 40 Meter Rock Mite/HB Version BLT Tuner
Message-ID: <IBEGLCMLCDHHEFLBPHBOMEKNCNAA.w0eb@cox.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Shack cleaning: FS, one Rock Mite RM-40 in the San Luis Machine Co. Mity Box. Modifications tested and functioning well - Added miniature polyvaricon cap in series with TX/RX crystal, gives freq swing from approximately 7,039.5 through 7,042.8. Changed P/A transistor from 2N2222A to 2SC799 and removed R18 - Power output is measured on an IFR-1200 commercial radio service monitor at 1.8 watts with 13.8V supply, 1.5+ Watts on 12V. As part of the package, I have a home grown version of the NorCal BLT tuner with the capability of tuning balanced and unbalanced antennas from 40 through 15 meters at a power level of 5-10 watts. Absorbtion LED type SWR bridge built in, using SUPER BRIGHT LED that you can even see in sunlight! Package deal - \$85 shipped in CONUS. Will consider splitting the package, RM40, \$65 and the Tuner,\$25, shipping included. I don't want to deal with Customs, so won't ship out of the 50 US States.

Payment methods: Money order or PayPal. If Pay Pal, add 5 bucks as they charge the seller a pretty hefty fee for use of their service.

Please email off list if interested.

First Email holds the package for receipt of funds.

Jim Sheldon, W0EB
2029 East Evanston Dr.
Wichita, KS 67219-1618
316-744-3022

<Nospam>w0eb@cox.net remove the <Nospam> for the proper email address.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/2003

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 07:01:31 -0600
From: "Rod N0RC" <rod@n0rc.us>
To: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>,
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157054] Re: YAHOO emails
Message-ID: <002601c36ef6\$d5cc92f0\$6501a8c0@greyrock>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Cc: <rod@n0rc.us>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2003 6:14 AM
Subject: Re: YAHOO emails

> Unless you are going after the spammer, the actual source of the email
> really doesn't matter, does it? If the "From:" address is from Yahoo
^^

It does to me. I prefer to attack the root cause of a problem.

> AOL, there's about a 95% shot that it's spam. Sure, it's annoying
that the
> header is forged, but Ed's problem, and mine, is not spending huge
amounts
> of time wading through junk, and filtering yahoo makes a big dent in
that.
>

As I said in my previous email, domain filtering is heavy handed....
There are more effective/sophisticated ways to filter spam. Using the
tools and services I mentioned takes no time or effort.

Your choice, I simply offer an alternative viewpoint.

That said, these firms offer a valuable free/low cost service to those who may otherwise not be able to afford email service. Thus, I will _NEVER_ filter anybody's email simply because it came from Yahoo, Hotmail, AOL or similar services.

73, Rod N0RC

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 08:14:41 -0400
From: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Cc: <rod@n0rc.us>
Subject: [157055] Re: YAHOO emails
Message-ID: <001101c36ef0\$4acd49c0\$080044c0@BrianBoru>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Unless you are going after the spammer, the actual source of the email really doesn't matter, does it? If the "From:" address is from Yahoo or AOL, there's about a 95% shot that it's spam. Sure, it's annoying that the header is forged, but Ed's problem, and mine, is not spending huge amounts of time wading through junk, and filtering yahoo makes a big dent in that.

I've finally taken the opposite approach. If my spam filters can find no reason to suspect I'm interested in the email, then it must be spam. I do check my spam bucket once in a while to see if anything that I want to see showed up there, and probably I miss a few. But I don't spend an hour a day deleting spam, and more importantly, most of them never get selected, and so don't get to phone home and invite their buddies.

72/73 de WB8RCR <http://www.qsl.net/wb8rcr>
didileydadidah QRP-L #1446 Code Warriors #35

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rod N0RC" <rod@n0rc.us>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 9:12 PM
Subject: Re: YAHOO emails

> Ed,
>
> Are you sure the emails were "SOURCED" from Yahoo? Email headers are
> very easy to forge, and a favorite trick of spammers. Here's is a link
> that may help to ID and possibly track down the real culprits.
>
> <http://www.junkbusters.com/spam.html#track>
>
> Not sure what Earthlink can do for you, but my ISP, FRII, uses
> mailarmory, I also use USA.NET's spam tools and I even have a Yahoo
> account (premium service) with spam filtering tools. All these service
> handle the "net lowlife" nicely with out having to resort to domain
> blocking. With few exceptions, domain blocking seems a heavy handed
> "baby out with the bathwater" approach.
>
> 73, Rod NØRC
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Ed Tanton" <n4xy@earthlink.net>
> To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
> Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 6:14 PM
> Subject: YAHOO emails
>
>
> > I have once again been forced to place YAHOO.COM in my TOTAL REJECT
> > category within my SPAM program. This comes as a result of a myriad of
> > clever little variations for return addresses all from YAHOO blatantly
>
>
>
>
>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 09:38:42 -0400
From: "George Osier" <gosier@twcnny.rr.com>
To: "QRP-L" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [157056] WTB : TT Model 979 Power supply
Message-ID: <001b01c36efc\$071f1f80\$74883a18@twcnny.rr.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Anyone have a Model 979 power supply for a Century 22 in EX condx
???????????????

E-mail; at : gosier@twcny.rr.com

Thanks !!!

George Osier , N2JNZ

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 08:56:40 -0500
From: "Joe Spencer" <kk5na@kk5na.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157057] Re: SuSe 8.2 disks
Message-ID: <1c0801c36efe\$89cba8c0\$6801a8c0@SZ6X6SEFX0>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have 3 copies of the SuSe 8.2 on CDs ready for mailing. The first three
e-mail's I receive will get them.

Remember you are to make two copies for someone else and pass them on.

Include your mailing address please.

73 Joe KK5NA

!

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 09:03:07 -0600
From: "Rod N0RC" <rod@n0rc.us>
To: "qrp-1" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157058] "SuperAntennas" PW-1/MP-1 tune-up
Message-ID: <006d01c36f07\$d24c3610\$6501a8c0@greyrock>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Folks,

Went to check out my PW-1 in prep for Monday's ARS sprint. It just didn't work properly. I could only tune 20-10m, and those bands weren't great, high SWR. When it was new, 40-10 just worked, and very well!

So, after some "007 spy investigatin'" I wound up cleaning and lubing all mating surfaces. The big culprit was the screw the makes the electrical connection to the coil. There was not even a DC connection.

The PW-1/MP-1 are made from different materials, aluminum, stainless steel, possibly others. The connection formed between these dissimilar metals are subject to "Galvanic Action"** and cause for concern.

A few notes and photos of my "tune-up" work can be found here:

<https://www.frii.com/~rwc/pw-1/>

According to my MFJ antenna analyzer, my PW-1 is now restored to as new operational condition. The acid test comes MON night during the ARS sprint.

73, Rod N0RC

** see:

<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=galvanic+action&spell=1>
for more info about Galvanic Action

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 10:03:29 -0500
From: "Jim Sheldon" <w0eb@cox.net>
To: "Flying Pigs Mailing List" <fpqrp-l@mpna.com>,
"Four States QRP Group" <4sqrp@mailman.qth.net>,
Subject: [157059] OT: FS 40 Meter Rock Mite/HB Version BLT Tuner - Both are SOLD
Message-ID: <IBEGLCMLCDHHEFLBPHB00EKOCNAA.w0eb@cox.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Both items have been spoken for.

Jim, W0EB

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/2003

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 15:10:12 +0000
From: "Leon Heller" <leon_heller@hotmail.com>
To: peterlee@qx.net, qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157060] Re: SMD question
Message-ID: <Law15-F49iyPoHZgzDg000145c2@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

>From: Peter Burbank <peterlee@qx.net>
>Reply-To: peterlee@qx.net
>To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
>Subject: SMD question
>Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 03:20:11 -0400
>
>After fumbling around with the DDS SMT parts I started wondering about how
>automated
>machines cope with them. I poked around with google but did not find much.
>Any good links?
>It must be a fairly exotic process, unwrapping, positioning, holding and
>soldering. Any info
>or descriptions from anyone who has seen one of these machines run would be
>of interest.

Try Googling with "pick and place". You'll find lots of stuff.

73, Leon

--

Leon Heller, G1HSM Tel: +44 1424 423947

Email:leon_heller@hotmail.com

My web page: http://www.geocities.com/leon_heller

Sign-up for a FREE BT Broadband connection today!
<http://www.msn.co.uk/specials/btbroadband>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 11:22:46 -0400
From: "Hudson, Steve (RBI-US RCD)" <sdhudson@reedbusiness.com>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157061] FT243 crystals
Message-ID: <A7E30DBD5928D442A7AE9EF215EEE133046B7FC1@bincmdgnorexc02.cahners.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

Found a bunch of FT243 hamband crystals that need new homes. \$5 each, or \$80 for the batch. Plus shipping from 30004.

Thanks,

Steve AA4BW

1935

3502 (this one is Z9C, essentially a metal-casted FT243)

3509

3525

3547

3700

3950

7000

7050

7055

7073.33

7125

7125 (another)

7148

7150

7155

7185

8583.333

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 08:27:25 -0700

From: Steve Ratzlaff <steveratz@eoni.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157062] Chart for SMD identifying?
Message-ID: <3F50C25D.F77EB7AE@eoni.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,
I have a board with a number of active devices I'd love to identify, but of course there are just cryptic markings on them. Anyone know where there might be some type of chart to identify such things?
The devices are given below, for reference.
Steve AA7U

part marking	device physical size
PGs	MMIC LNA or PHEMT Tran, 6 pin
61	5 pin sot-23-5
S79	6 pin sot-363
D3	6 pin sot-363
H.5	5 pin sot-23-5
9L2P	5 pin sot-23-5
202L	5 pin sot-23-5

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 11:34:32 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Cc: <peterlee@qx.net>
Subject: [157063] Re: SMD question
Message-ID: <002b01c36f0c\$3aafdb40\$0200a8c0@charter.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>After fumbling around with the DDS SMT parts I started wondering about how
>automated
>machines cope with them. I poked around with google but did not find much.

The machines generally use what's called a pick and place process.

Parts come in reels that look like old 8mm movie film. It's two layers of mylar, one layer that 'peels off' and the other layer a series of 'cups' that

hold the parts in a common orientation.

The machines peel the tape, pull the part, and place it on the board in the 'programmed' spot.

The one example I've experience with, the machine uses 'vapor' to melt solder, but I guess there's a few different technologies to do that.

At one point, years ago, I know you could get your 'through hole' parts with little donuts of solder already on the leads... But back then it was more common to 'float' your board over a 'lake' of solder and it would flow up in the desired holes.

Larger parts come in 'tubes', although the tubes are generally 'flat'. I suppose you could get things like CPUs in reels, but I've never seen them.

In any case, the whole thing is pretty much automated.

Mike

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:18:24 +0100
From: "Leon Heller" <leon_heller@hotmail.com>
To: "Low Power" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157064] Multiband QRP Tx with < 20 parts
Message-ID: <Law15-DAV28XrRjbDt3000025ad@hotmail.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

George Dobbs G3RJV of G-QRP and SPRAT fame, Practical Wireless's resident "sin bosun", has an interesting design for a simple Tx in the Sept. issue. He set himself the task of building a multi-band Tx with less than 20 parts, and just about managed it with a simple Tx based on GM30XX's 'ONER'. It uses a 2N2222A Pierce crystal oscillator direct-coupled to a VN10KLS MOSFET PA, with a three-element LP filter. A PNP device keys the output stage. Crystal and output filter are plug-in, and component values are given for all bands from 1.8 MHz to 18 MHz. Power output is between 1 W and 3W.

73, Leon

--

Leon Heller, G1HSM
leon_heller@hotmail.com
http://www.geocities.com/leon_heller

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:01:46 +0000
From: "Alan Fryer" <N3BJ@hotmail.com>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157065] FS: 2N2/40 Transceiver
Message-ID: <Law9-0E29s3AQCHwhkL00003145@hotmail.com>

For Sale: K8IQY 2N2/40 40M QRP xcvr. Nicely done in a rugged case. With vernier dial, S meter and speaker. Receives, but could use a going over, which I just don't have time to do. Here's your chance to try this unique rig without gathering all the parts, etc. \$100.00 shipped

Alan, N3BJ
Bent Mountain, VA

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 12:54:26 -0500
From: Wayne Rogers <w5kdj@juno.com>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157066] Comments
Message-ID: <20030830.125427.-1708215.1.w5kdj@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Need comments on the SW+ series of xcvrs. Can the output power be controlled? How is the receiver on image rejection and its sensitivity/selectivity?

Wayne_W5KDJ
ex: SV0WWW_TF2WJN *e-QSL*
ARS_1392 ARCI_11325 FP-626
FISTS_10060 SOC_538 ARRL

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 13:02:31 -0500
From: "Tim" <kd5ckp@centurytel.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157067] Re: Bencher "Look Alikes"
Message-ID: <009b01c36f20\$e48f0280\$0101a8c0@tech1>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks to all that have replied.

I have received some very interesting replies and the consensus seems to be that this is either a "Limited Edition" that Bencher produced (unconfirmed by Bencher) or that this is a modified ST-1 or possibly even a JY-2, but over all everyone seems to agree that it is a Bencher. I have attempted to contact the seller and see if they know any of the history of the paddle, but so far I have not received a response.

Thanks again and 73
Tim KD5CKP

----- Original Message -----

> <http://www.qsl.net/kd5ckp/Bencher/>

>

> I was told that this could NOT be a Bencher because Bencher never produced a

> paddle like this, but I also found this www.7j3aab.com/bencher.asp . I am
> not arguing the point I simply would like to know who did produce it if it
> is not a Bencher and why did the previous owner (SK) put a Bencher logo on
> it.

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 11:17:12 -0700 (PDT)
From: Shawn Upton <kb1ckkt@yahoo.com>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157068] NorCal BLT
Message-ID: <20030830181712.83292.qmail@web10105.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi, I just tried this out on 15m, and couldn't make it
tune--the LED just wouldn't go out. Is this normal?
My FT-817 doesn't indicate SWR on HF/6m, and I grabbed
the BLT in hopes of being able to try to make some
contacts on HF while on vacation. But I don't want to
take out my finals "guessing" that my swr is ok on my
B&W portable antenna. (One of my goals this vacation
is to finally make a contact on this antenna!)

Speaking of which--does anyone have an idea where to
look on my 817 for the problem on HF/6m power output
detection circuitry? I'm away from home, don't have

the schematics, might be able to buy one at RS for a few bucks, to do a bad solder joint (it has worked occasionally in the past, so...), and I could never read the stupid Yaesu schematic that came with it anyhow.

Thanks
KB1CKT

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! SiteBuilder - Free, easy-to-use web site design software
<http://sitebuilder.yahoo.com>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 12:27:05 -0600
From: "NR5A" <nr5a@rap.midco.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157069] Coming Soon! ! !
Message-ID: <005701c36f24\$50c83630\$3865dc18@jerry>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Flying Pigs QRP Club, International is proud to announce
Run For The Bacon - PSK
Monday, 8th of September 2003, 0000Z to 0200Z

For those of you that are ZULU/GMT/UTC challanged,
this contest runs from 8 PM to 10 PM, Sunday September 7th in New York City

RULES
PSK ONLY
Catagories: Single band
Exchange: RST, SPC (State/Province/Country), FP# (non-members send power)
QSO Points: Member = 3 points, Member different continent = 5 points, non member = 1 point
Multipliers: S/P/C total for all bands
more than 50 members worked = X 2
Power: QRP only (qrp defined as 5 watts or less)
Final Score: (Total QSO points) * (total S/P/C) * 2 (if 50 plus members worked)
Suggested Frequencies PSK31: 14071

Reporting:

AUTOLOG via the Web

This is the quickest and easiest way to send in your log!
(does an auto calculation for you)

Send summary in plain text only (no attachments) via e-mail to:

Jerry, NR5A
ATTEN: FP Sprint PSK
nr5a@rap.midco.net
or VIA USMAIL to:

Jerry Felts, NR5A
PO BOX 1033
BOX ELDER SD 57719

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 10:12:29 -0500
From: "Jerry Ford" <benlightnd13@mchsi.com>
To: "qrp-l" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>, "FPigs" <fpqrp-l@mpna.com>
Subject: [157070] Re: Coming Soon! ! !
Message-ID: <00f301c36f09\$215ae660\$0077da0c@mchsi.com>

00000WWWEEEEEE G0000000DDDDDDYY

More fun working dem piggies !!

Good job Jerry and see ya on the air.

72 oo Jerry N0JRN
----- Original Message -----
From: "NR5A" <nr5a@rap.midco.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2003 1:27 PM
Subject: Coming Soon! ! !

> The Flying Pigs QRP Club, International is proud to announce
> Run For The Bacon - PSK
> Monday, 8th of September 2003, 0000Z to 0200Z
>
> For those of you that are ZULU/GMT/UTC challanged,
> this contest runs from 8 PM to 10 PM, Sunday September 7th in New
York City

>
> RULES
> PSK ONLY
> Catagories: Single band
> Exchange: RST, SPC (State/Province/Country), FP# (non-members
send
> power)
> QSO Points: Member = 3 points, Member different continent = 5
points,
> non member = 1 point
> Multipliers: S/P/C total for all bands
> more than 50 members worked = X 2
> Power: QRP only (qrp defined as 5 watts or less)
> Final Score: (Total QSO points) * (total S/P/C) * 2 (if 50
plus
> members worked)
> Suggested Frequencies PSK31: 14071
>
> Reporting:
>
> AUTOLOG via the Web
>
> This is the quickest and easiest way to send in your log!
> (does an auto calculation for you)
>
> Send summary in plain text only (no attachments) via e-mail
to:
>
> Jerry, NR5A
> ATTEN: FP Sprint PSK
> nr5a@rap.midco.net
> or VIA USMAIL to:
>
> Jerry Felts, NR5A
> PO BOX 1033
> BOX ELDER SD 57719
>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 15:02:10 -0400
From: Jack e wigal <kr8z1@juno.com>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157071] AGC
Message-ID: <20030830.150456.-782695.1.kr8z1@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi folks, I just dug out my old "Mini Misers Dream" rcvr built from a Doug DeMaw article back in mid 70's. Has anyone built an agc circuit for it. It has an MC1306P audio chip and IF is MC1350P. Please reply direct to kr8z1@juno.com

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 15:04:55 -0400
From: Jack e wigal <kr8z1@juno.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157072] White Mountain 75
Message-ID: <20030830.150456.-782695.2.kr8z1@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Want to buy WM-75 from Small Wonder Labs. Prefer unbuilt, but will consider any offer. Please reply direct to kr8z1@juno.com Tnx, Jack, kr8z

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 15:00:34 -0400
From: "Martin Hartwell" <chartwell@worldnet.att.net>
To: "QRP-L" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [157073] Sold keyer and sw-30
Message-ID: <LCEBJOKPGPNGOAKECJNGOEHNCLAA.chartwell@worldnet.att.net>

Hi
Subject says it all, I have sold these items.

Marty kd8bj

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 13:28:05 -0600
From: "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
To: qRP-L@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157074] URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <3F50A665.16358.79B39C@localhost>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Content-description: Mail message body

The following text is from the ARRL Letter Vol 22 No 34 dated 8/29/03. It details 6 (count 'em) petitions for rulemaking to eliminate or change the Morse requirement. PLEASE follow the instructions and file a comment on each and every one. Also please consider petitioning the FCC to make a rule regarding the filing of multiple, substantially similar petitions. In the case of the NCVEC petition, if you are an ARRL member you might mention that the ARRL VEC abstained from voting on the issue and your (my? our?) opinion that the NCVEC has no business petitioning without unanimous support, especially when the abstainer is the biggest VEC. I would question whether the NCVEC has the legal standing to file a petition in any case-- it's the "National Conference" of VECs or an organization that "represents" other organizations that "represent" their members who are VE's who were never polled on THEIR opinions!.

Again, please do your part to man the barricades!

73 DE Marshall, N1FN

[ARRL Letter Vol 22 No 34 dated 8/24/03.]

==>FCC INVITES COMMENTS ON SIX MORSE CODE-RELATED PETITIONS

The FCC has invited public comments on six separate Morse code-related petitions for rule making, some of which would altogether eliminate Element 1, the 5 WPM Morse test, from the Amateur Service rules (Part 97). World Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03) made optional the requirement to prove the ability to send and receive Morse signals to operate below 30 MHz.

A petition from Peter M. Beauregard, KI1I, designated RM-10781, would give all Technician licensees current Novice/Tech Plus CW privileges on 80, 40, 15 and 10 meters and limited phone and image privileges on 80, 40 and 10 meters. Beauregard said the CW privileges would "encourage Technician class licensees to upgrade to General" by giving them a "practice area." He has proposed new Tech phone/image privileges on 3850-3900 kHz and 7225-7300 kHz. His petition would not eliminate Element 1, however.

Pete V. Coppola, KG4QDZ, and family--Tina Coppola, KG4YUM, and Pete A. Coppola, KG4QDY--have asked the FCC to eliminate Element 1 from the rules. The Coppolas' petition, designated RM-10782, would grant Tech Plus HF privileges to current Technician licensees. It also would retain the current CW-only subbands. The Coppolas asked the FCC to make the change effective immediately on a provisional basis.

Kiernan K. Holliday, WA6BJH, has asked the FCC simply to "remove all requirements for knowledge of Morse code" from the Amateur Service rules. Holliday said there is less reason to require Morse code in the Amateur Service today. In his petition, designated RM-10783, Holliday also said the code requirement limits the ability of handicapped individuals to get

ham tickets. "The Commission's policy should be to encourage the use of Amateur Radio," he said.

Dale Reich, K8AD, petitioned the FCC to delete Element 1 for General class applicants but keep it in place for Extra class applicants. Under Reich's scheme, "no-code" Techs wanting HF privileges would have to upgrade to General first. Reich's petition is designated RM-10784.

Eric Ward, N0HHS, seeks immediate elimination of "proficiency in telegraphy using Morse code." The "immediate removal of the telegraphy requirement from Amateur Radio licensing is appropriate and clearly in the public interest," Ward contended in his petition, designated RM-10785.

In a detailed, nine-page petition, the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is calling on the FCC to delete Element 1 and give "Tech Plus" privileges to current Technician licensees. The NCVEC also asked the FCC to "take expedited action" to allow volunteer examiner coordinators (VECs) to discontinue administering Element 1 "as soon as possible."

"The Amateur Service community suffers from the loss to its ranks of a large number of potentially excellent operators who are turned away because of the CW requirement," the NCVEC petition said.

The organization, the umbrella group for the 14 VECs in the US, said there's "no longer any reasonable justification for requiring an applicant to demonstrate this antiquated skill," and that most applicants never use Morse after they pass the test. The NCVEC petition is designated RM-10787.

The ARRL-VEC abstained from voting on the NCVEC's petition question when it came up during the NCVEC's July 25 meeting in Pennsylvania. At its own July meeting in Connecticut, the ARRL Board of Directors affirmed its interest in reviewing members' input on the Morse issue as well as on other possible revisions to Part 97 arising from WRC-03. The Board's current position is to retain the Morse requirement for HF access.

Two more recently filed petitions--one from No Code International and another from two amateur licensees--are expected to be put on public notice in the near future.

Interested parties may file comments on any or all of these petitions using the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>, which also permits users to view the petitions and all comments on file. There is a 30-day comment window.

To file a comment, click on "Submit a Filing" under "ECFS Main Links." In the "Proceeding" field, type the full RM number, including the hyphen, and complete the required fields. "RM" must be in capital letters, and you

must include the hyphen between "RM" and the five-digit number. You may type your remarks into a form or attach a file. ECFS also accepts comments in active proceedings via e-mail, per instructions on the ECFS page.

While a Morse code exam element remains on the books in the US, Canada and elsewhere, a handful of countries--including Switzerland, Belgium, the UK, Germany, Norway and the Netherlands--already have moved to drop their Morse requirements. Austria and New Zealand are expected to do so soon.
dated

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 14:33:47 -0600
From: "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
To: qRP-L@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157075] FCC Petitions
Message-ID: <3F50B5CB.6896.B5DC08@localhost>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-description: Mail message body

Another list member me to say he'd spent 15 minutes trying (unsuccessfully) to find the petitions on the FCC web site-- and I just wasted 45 minutes of my own time doing the same.

If anybody knows how to find the numbers for the six petitions please let the list know, or let me know, or post the 6 relevant numbers to the list.

I will write to ARRL Letter and ask them to update their list.

73
Marshall Emm
N1FN/VK5FN
n1fn@MorseX.com
Morse Express and Oak Hills Research
"Everything for the Morse Enthusiast"
<http://www.MorseX.com>
<http://www.ohr.com>
(303)752-3382
--

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 16:37:43 -0400
From: "John Sielke" <jsielke@pobox.com>

To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [157076] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <3F50D2D7.19873.4CC8AA8@localhost>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-description: Mail message body

What I find really interesting is that when the ARRL Rep abstained, I wrote rather heated correspondence to Directors, and to the ARRL President. All told me that he abstained because there was "no ARRL policy in place." BUT, the ARRL's own representative stated that "ARRL policy is to MAINTAIN the CW requirement."

Then, in further skullduggery, I was told "don't sweat it, Nothing will happen until after the January 2004 Director's Meeting. " RIGHT! So now we have 6 petitions to respond to, and where is the ARRL "representing" us?

John W2AGN

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 21:48:27 +0100
From: Chuck Adams <k7qo@commspeed.net>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157077] SWL SW-XX+ Series
Message-ID: <5.2.1.1.0.20030830210820.019bfd10@mail.commspeed.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I consider this little rig a jewel and for only \$55 for the PC board and parts on the board you can't beat it. Especially for new kit builders and it does provide a very economical way into the hobby for those on very limited budgets. Not every one has a large budget for hobbies.

<http://www.smallwonderlabs.com/>

I am not an employee of SWL nor do I get any funding for this.
I am a serious kit builder as Dave Benson realizes more than any one else. :-)

The power out is adjustable with an internal pot from 0 to 2.0 or so watts. It will not get you 5W if you think you need that much power. Keying is clean and the receiver has excellent sensitivity. Selectivity isn't meant to make it a contest type rig. Just a little rig to enjoy

for casual operation. I have WAS and about 45 countries on 30m with one on battery and 0.95W output to a vee-beam. I have another on 40m that was also used for WAS at 0.95W and now working at 0.50W when the QRN season is over here in AZ. (I have a #10 wire shorting out the 300 ohm window line to the TenTec tuner. Yesterday a lighting strike 1km away still caused the internal caps to arc over!! No rig attached.)

I have a construction article on my web page on building the SW-30+ that I just finished in PDF format with color photos. Take a gander at it. It is the article that I have on the web for years and the one that appeared some time back in the NorCal QRPP. Part of the old Elmer101 project years back.

I just 30 minutes ago got an email from Dave B. giving me permission to again put the schematic back on the web. The Manhattan layout is there in prelim form also pointed to by another link. I haven't built it yet. Work in progress.

I was suspicious of some of the photos in the article and will work on the article again today.

I put it aside and I like to come back and reread it through and catch errors that may have crept or rushed in....

*****thought of this the last couple of days and wrote a posting but held up*****

*****I put the posting in a file just in case it could fly, otherwise it dies a quick death****

I'm thinking of a building contest using only the SWL rig but you have to build it Manhattan or Pittsburgh Style. 2yr sub to AmQRP Homebrewer for first and one

year each for second and third places. Those that have already built the Ft Smith sidekick and want to go with this can build a matching transmitter. In order for me to do this I need 20+ entries as it will cost me about \$150 to sponsor the contest with prizes and certificates.

I need NA5N, K8IQY, K1SWL, and a couple of others to judge with me if it goes. If I get the interest and Dave can ship kits in a timely fashion, then we can go with this. It's getting close to the fall building season.... Let me know off line and I'll post more info if we generate enough interest. Contest to run for only 4 weeks, so you can't sit around on this one. I'm guessing 10 days from the announcement to the start date and 45 days thereafter to build and debug.

I'm waiting to hear back from Dave on availability of the kits and how many he has.

I may have to drive to CT and help. :-) ;-)

Many thanks to Dave Benson, NN1G/K1SWL, for all his work since the NE4040 club project with the New England QRP Club and his work in the QRP ARCI Quarterly and all the great stuff he has done since then. He is not one to sit around and rest for long periods of time.

FYI

Chuck Adams K7QO k7qo@commspeed.net
http://www.qsl.net/k7qo CP-60
I have made this letter longer than usual, because I lack the time to make it short. --- B. Pascal

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 15:09:38 -0600
From: "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>
To: qRP-L@lehigh.edu
Subject: [157078] FCC Petition Nuimbers
Message-ID: <3F50BE32.20770.D6AE92@localhost>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-description: Mail message body

Wow-- is my face red-- the petition numbers are in the text, so presumably you will be able to file comments with no difficulty. Here they are in summary...

Peter M. Beauregard, KI1I, ... RM-10781,

Pete V. Coppola, KG4QDZ, and family--Tina Coppola, KG4YUM, and Pete A. Coppola, KG4QDY... RM-10782,

Kiernan K. Holliday, WA6BJH ... RM-10783,

Dale Reich, K8AD... RM-10784,

Eric Ward, N0HHS .. RM-10785.

...National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) ..sRM-10787.

Sorry for the confusion...

Marshall Emm
N1FN/VK5FN
n1fn@MorseX.com
Morse Express and Oak Hills Research
"Everything for the Morse Enthusiast"
<http://www.MorseX.com>
<http://www.ohr.com>
(303)752-3382
--

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:29:59 -0400
From: "Howard Kraus" <K2UD@adelphia.net>
To: <qrp-L@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157079] FS: Trimmer Caps
Message-ID: <000701c36f3d\$dea74c20\$30131443@buf.adelphia.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some treasures from the basement.

(7) 1.2-10pf ceramic piston trimmers, unused, vertical PCB mount. Bought from Surplus Sales of Nebraska, never used them. Bruene-type wattmeter or SWR bridge in your future?

(1) Electromotive (looks like an ARCO) PD52716 200-1200pf panel mount ceramic trimmer. For you dip and tune guys, this would be the load cap for your tube rig, should work down to 7, perhaps 3.5 MHz (depending on your pi-net design). Minus the mounting nut, used.

I'll send these to you for a \$7.00 bill. Or send two 3's and a 1.

72

Howard Kraus, K2UD

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:19:29 -0400
From: "Russ Hines" <wb8zcc@fuse.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>,
 <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>

Cc: "XU Radio Club" <Xu@wb8nut.com>

Subject: [157080] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment

Message-ID: <000701c36f3c\$662b23d0\$4307c00a@WB8ZCC2>

Marshall:

I applaud you for your concern. You have been a good contributor and supplier to the needs of hams everywhere, and I thank you. You made a public post and it was a great effort, but its focus IMHO was somewhat misplaced.

The barbarians are indeed at the gate, but it's BPL, not the loss of a 5 WPM testing requirement, that presents us with our greatest challenge and potential tragedy.

A few notes on your points:

"Also please consider petitioning the FCC to make a rule regarding the filing of multiple, substantially similar petitions."

This is folly, because it potentially denies individuals the right to petition their government, a right guaranteed by our U.S. Constitution I might add.

"In the case of the NCVEC petition, if you are an ARRL member you might mention that the ARRL VEC abstained from voting on the issue..."

It's interesting that the ARRL VEC abstained. While The League's "official" position is to maintain the status quo, I believe they realize that a vote one way or the other on this issue might sway, persuade or intimidate others of differing opinions. How does amateur radio benefit if "the biggest VEC" directly or indirectly bullies an outcome with which many may not agree? No doubt many of these dissenters are League members.

"... and your (my? our?) opinion that the NCVEC has no business petitioning without unanimous support, especially when the abstainer is the biggest VEC."

Obviously, you are well aware of the influence the ARRL VEC might have on this issue.

As for petitioning without unanimous support, I don't know this for a fact, but I doubt that the rules the NCVEC have adopted to govern themselves specify unanimous decision making. Such a policy would make the group rather ineffectual. My guess is your post would be more supportive if the NCVEC never filed a petition supporting a position with which you disagree.

"I would question whether the NCVEC has the legal

standing to file a petition in any case-- it's the "National Conference" of VECs or an organization that "represents" other organizations that "represent" their members who are VE's who were never polled on THEIR opinions!"

Interesting concept, Marshall. My U.S. Congressman makes decisions and casts votes on bills all the time with which I don't agree and on which his constituents were never polled. I believe leadership requires no polls to be taken, but a good leader will listen, get a "feel" of the pulse of his constituents on an issue before making a decision. Otherwise, any monkey would suffice.

Mr. Emm, I have manned the barricades, by making this post and my submitting a comment to the FCC regarding the BPL issue. That's where I believe the danger to amateur radio lies.

Again, thanks for your post. I did not initially think it was self-serving.

73,
Russ
WB8ZCC

----- Original Message -----

From: "Marshall Emm" <mgemm@mtechnologies.com>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2003 3:28 PM

Subject: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment

> The following text is from the ARRL Letter Vol 22 No 34 dated 8/29/03. It
> details 6 (count 'em) petitions for rulemaking to eliminate or change the
Morse
> requirement. PLEASE follow the instructions and file a comment on each
and
> every one. Also please consider petitioning the FCC to make a rule
regarding
> the filing of multiple, substantially similar petitions. In the case of
the
> NCVEC petition, if you are an ARRL member you might mention that the ARRL
VEC
> abstained from voting on the issue and your (my? our?) opinion that the
NCVEC
> has no business petitioning without unanimous support, especially when the
> abstainer is the biggest VEC. I would question whether the NCVEC has the
legal

> standing to file a petition in any case-- it's the "National Conference"
of
> VECs or an organization that "represents" other organizations that
"represent"
> their members who are VE's who were never polled on THEIR opinions!..
>
> Again, please do your part to man the barricades!
> 73 DE Marshall, N1FN
> ---
> [ARRL Letter Vol 22 No 34 dated 8/24/03.]
> ==>FCC INVITES COMMENTS ON SIX MORSE CODE-RELATED PETITIONS
>
> The FCC has invited public comments on six separate Morse code-related
> petitions for rule making, some of which would altogether eliminate
> Element 1, the 5 WPM Morse test, from the Amateur Service rules (Part 97).
> World Radiocommunication Conference 2003 (WRC-03) made optional the
> requirement to prove the ability to send and receive Morse signals to
> operate below 30 MHz.
>
> A petition from Peter M. Beauregard, KI1I, designated RM-10781, would give
> all Technician licensees current Novice/Tech Plus CW privileges on 80, 40,
> 15 and 10 meters and limited phone and image privileges on 80, 40 and 10
> meters. Beauregard said the CW privileges would "encourage Technician
> class licensees to upgrade to General" by giving them a "practice area."
> He has proposed new Tech phone/image privileges on 3850-3900 kHz and
> 7225-7300 kHz. His petition would not eliminate Element 1, however.
>
> Pete V. Coppola, KG4QDZ, and family--Tina Coppola, KG4YUM, and Pete A.
> Coppola, KG4QDY--have asked the FCC to eliminate Element 1 from the rules.
> The Coppolas' petition, designated RM-10782, would grant Tech Plus HF
> privileges to current Technician licensees. It also would retain the
> current CW-only subbands. The Coppolas asked the FCC to make the change
> effective immediately on a provisional basis.
>
> Kiernan K. Holliday, WA6BJH, has asked the FCC simply to "remove all
> requirements for knowledge of Morse code" from the Amateur Service rules.
> Holliday said there is less reason to require Morse code in the Amateur
> Service today. In his petition, designated RM-10783, Holliday also said
> the code requirement limits the ability of handicapped individuals to get
> ham tickets. "The Commission's policy should be to encourage the use of
> Amateur Radio," he said.
>
> Dale Reich, K8AD, petitioned the FCC to delete Element 1 for General class
> applicants but keep it in place for Extra class applicants. Under Reich's
> scheme, "no-code" Techs wanting HF privileges would have to upgrade to
> General first. Reich's petition is designated RM-10784.
>
> Eric Ward, N0HHS, seeks immediate elimination of "proficiency in

> telegraphy using Morse code." The "immediate removal of the telegraphy
> requirement from Amateur Radio licensing is appropriate and clearly in the
> public interest," Ward contended in his petition, designated RM-10785.
>
> In a detailed, nine-page petition, the National Conference of Volunteer
> Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is calling on the FCC to delete Element 1
> and give "Tech Plus" privileges to current Technician licensees. The NCVEC
> also asked the FCC to "take expedited action" to allow volunteer examiner
> coordinators (VECs) to discontinue administering Element 1 "as soon as
> possible."
>
> "The Amateur Service community suffers from the loss to its ranks of a
> large number of potentially excellent operators who are turned away
> because of the CW requirement," the NCVEC petition said.
>
> The organization, the umbrella group for the 14 VECs in the US, said
> there's "no longer any reasonable justification for requiring an applicant
> to demonstrate this antiquated skill," and that most applicants never use
> Morse after they pass the test. The NCVEC petition is designated RM-10787.
>
> The ARRL-VEC abstained from voting on the NCVEC's petition question when
> it came up during the NCVEC's July 25 meeting in Pennsylvania. At its own
> July meeting in Connecticut, the ARRL Board of Directors affirmed its
> interest in reviewing members' input on the Morse issue as well as on
> other possible revisions to Part 97 arising from WRC-03. The Board's
> current position is to retain the Morse requirement for HF access.
>
> Two more recently filed petitions--one from No Code International and
> another from two amateur licensees--are expected to be put on public
> notice in the near future.
>
> Interested parties may file comments on any or all of these petitions
> using the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS)
> <<http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>>, which also permits users to view the
> petitions and all comments on file. There is a 30-day comment window.
>
> To file a comment, click on "Submit a Filing" under "ECFS Main Links." In
> the "Proceeding" field, type the full RM number, including the hyphen, and
> complete the required fields. "RM" must be in capital letters, and you
> must include the hyphen between "RM" and the five-digit number. You may
> type your remarks into a form or attach a file. ECFS also accepts comments
> in active proceedings via e-mail, per instructions on the ECFS page.
>
> While a Morse code exam element remains on the books in the US, Canada and
> elsewhere, a handful of countries--including Switzerland, Belgium, the UK,
> Germany, Norway and the Netherlands--already have moved to drop their
> Morse requirements. Austria and New Zealand are expected to do so soon.
> dated

>
>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:13:11 -0400
From: "Tom Bowman" <wa3rey@comcast.net>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [157081] OT, slightly
Message-ID: <000501c36f43\$e734e040\$08415344@TOMS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,

I need a 500pf at 20KV disc cap to fit in the high voltage section of my Tek
454
scope I am repairing. I already tried the Tek list at Yahoo and two other
Tek gurus with no luck
so I am turning to folks with large junk boxes here.

Please reply off the list to wa3rey@comcast.net

Thanks for everyone's patience and have a nice holiday weekend.

73,

Tom

Tom Bowman, WA3REY, Mount Gretna, PA USA
(All mail scanned by Norton 2002)

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:58:08 -0400
From: "n3drk" <n3drk@triad.rr.com>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [157082] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <005901c36f41\$cc6319f0\$6400a8c0@n3drk>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: "Russ Hines" <wb8zcc@fuse.net>

You made a
> public post and it was a great effort, but its focus IMHO was somewhat
> misplaced.
>
> The barbarians are indeed at the gate, but it's BPL, not the loss of a 5
WPM
> testing requirement,>

WRONG! The problem is not BPL. The FCC is not going to allow this to happen.
The problem is the loss of CW and the decadence of the ham radio hobby as we
have know it. The Bozos are already at the front door of the FCC complaining
about 5 WPM testing. They would love to turn the HF bands into what 75
meters presently is.

john

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:26:10 -0400
From: "w8diz" <w8diz@cinci.rr.com>
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157083] Re: OT, slightly
Message-ID: <000801c36f45\$b72779b0\$b8cf1d41@cinci.rr.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: "Tom Bowman" <wa3rey@comcast.net>

> Hi,
> I need a 500pf at 20KV disc cap to fit in the high voltage
> section of my Tek 454 scope I am repairing.

Sure Tom...we believe you...we know it's not for that 3-500Z coupling ...

-Diz, W8DIZ

Date: Sun, 31 Aug 2003 01:39:27 +0300
From: Paul <mooney@cytanet.com.cy>
To: n3drk@triad.rr.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157084] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <1062283166.10688.20.camel@localhost>
Content-Type: text/plain
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Sun, 2003-08-31 at 00:58, n3drk wrote:

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Russ Hines" <wb8zcc@fuse.net>
> You made a
> > public post and it was a great effort, but its focus IMHO was somewhat
> > misplaced.
> >
> > The barbarians are indeed at the gate, but it's BPL, not the loss of a 5
> WPM
> > testing requirement,>
>
> WRONG! The problem is not BPL. The FCC is not going to allow this to happen.
> The problem is the loss of CW and the decadence of the ham radio hobby as we
> have know it. The Bozos are already at the front door of the FCC complaining
> about 5 WPM testing. They would love to turn the HF bands into what 75
> meters presently is.
>
> john
>

Sorry, I can't see any reason for keeping the morse requirement, other than 'we had to do it, so they ought to'.

It is only getting rid of the international requirement - not banning morse. As others have said, why not welcome this as an opportunity to get more folks into the hobby, and help them to recognise the benefits of morse rather than alienating them?

All over the world administrations are removing the requirement, are you going to refuse to communicate with those that don't have a morse test? If so, how are you going to identify them, esp. if they use morse?

Paul M

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 17:54:47 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Scott Rosenfeld [N7JI]" <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>
To: unlisted-recipients;; (no To-header on input)
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [157085] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0308301749310.4450-100000@w3eax.umd.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Actually, the threat really is from two different points in space:

- 1) Other services with lots of \$\$\$ want our turf.
- 2) A smorgasboard of other activities dilutes the amount of focus any one person can devote to any one hobby/activity/pasttime.

In trying to make it easier to get people into the hobby to protect against either of the above two attacks, the "dumbing down," or "least common denominator" argument starts to come into play.

The answer?

- a) operate
- b) proselytize
- c) teach willingly
- d) feel enabled, empowered when you know someone else is doing something wrong
- e) be strong enough to have someone correct you without getting bent out of shape

On Sat, 30 Aug 2003, n3drk wrote:

```
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Russ Hines" <wb8zcc@fuse.net>
>   You made a
> > public post and it was a great effort, but its focus IMHO was somewhat
> > misplaced.
> >
> > The barbarians are indeed at the gate, but it's BPL, not the loss of a 5
> WPM
> > testing requirement,>
>
> WRONG! The problem is not BPL. The FCC is not going to allow this to happen.
> The problem is the loss of CW and the decadence of the ham radio hobby as we
> have know it. The Bozos are already at the front door of the FCC complaining
> about 5 WPM testing. They would love to turn the HF bands into what 75
> meters presently is.
```

>
> john
>

--

Scott Rosenfeld ARS N7JI
541-684-9970 Eugene, OR Land o' much rain
If you find me on the air, I'm probably in my car
ham@w3eax.umd.edu <http://w3eax.umd.edu/~ham>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:43:33 -0400
From: "Lawrence Makoski" <Makos327@worldnet.att.net>
To: <jsielke@pobox.com>,
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <grp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [157086] Re: URGENT re FCC Petitions Open for Comment
Message-ID: <006001c36f48\$25349f80\$15b9590c@larrysahyqy001>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

John,

Once again, as so often happens seems to happen, it appears that we can no longer depend on our representatives. It is becoming increasingly apparent, in my humble opinion, that despite their hitherto standing of public support of the Morse requirement; the ARRL would be just as happy to see it go away. What is more disturbing is their desire to do this in a "see-our-hands-are-clean?" kind of way. I would really hate to think; or see in the future, for that matter, that the outcome of this issue was determined by the money making special interests of some group.

So then it seems this is going to go down to the wire with the proponents of the Morse Code requirement fighting this out on our own, the best we can. I would urge all proponents of the Morse Code requirement file their comments with the FCC. Both the ARRL and FCC websites explain, in all reality, how easy this is to do.

It seems to me that the main arguments are that Morse Code is out of date, so it no longer retains any validity. I believe this argument to be balderdash. The other main argument seems to be that somehow maintaining a Morse Code requirement is discriminatory. We citizens of the United States have to avoid this current fad of labelling something discriminatory just because one person or group finds it so. Please

back up your claims with documented research!

I would think it would be in the best interest of the United States of America to lead the group of nations and maintain itself as a shining beacon by not only keeping the Morse Code requirement; but to also make the written part of the exam more relevant and meaningful. With the state of the world as it is, it would seem the USA would want it's "trained cadre of those interested in the radio arts" to be the best, brightest and most THOROUGHLY trained as possible - not the opposite.

73 de Larry W2LJ - Vivat Morse!

W2LJ@arrl.net

<http://www.qsl.net/w2lj>

ARRL Lifemember QRP ARCI #4488 NJQRP #47
FISTS #1469 QRP-L #778 FP #612 QRPp-I #759
ARS #1528 --- K1 #1647

End of QRP-L Digest 3028

